

REMARKS

I. 35 U.S.C. 112

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 21-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicates that the claims do not set forth any steps involved in the method and is unclear what method applicant is intending to encompass.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 21-31 as indefinite and not involving any steps. Claims 21-31 are amended to depend on amended Claim 28, which provides steps (a)-(j).

Claims 21-27 merely provides structural limitation to an element within one of the steps of amended Claim 28. Therefore, Claims 21-27 incorporate all the steps of amended Claim 28. For example, Claim 21 limits the black light responsive projectile of step (a) to be a disk, such that step (a) essentially recites “providing at least one black light responsive disk,” which is an allowable dependent method claim. Therefore, Claims 21-27 are believed to be proper dependent method claims.

Claims 28-31 are amended to clearly recite the steps involving the added elements. Therefore, Claims 28-31 are also believed to be proper dependent method claims.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103 – Fusi

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 1-14, 17, 19-28, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fusi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,415,151) in view of Applicant’s Admission of Prior Art (“AAPA”).

Claims 1 and 20 are canceled and all claims previously dependent from these claims are amended to depend on amended Claims 14 and 28, respectively, which are indicated as being allowable and believed to be allowable, respectively. See, §IV, infra. Therefore, this rejection is now believed to be moot.

III. 35 U.S.C. §103 – Fusi and Hornsby

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Examiner’s rejection of Claims 18 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fusi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,415,151) in view of Applicant’s Admission of Prior Art (“AAPA”) and further in view of Hornsby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,648,726).

Claim 18 is amended to depend on allowable Claim 14 and Claim 32 is amended to depend on amended Claim 28, which is believed to be allowable. See, §IV, infra. Therefore, this rejection is now believed to be moot.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner’s indication that Claims 14-17 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 14 and 17 are amended to be in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claims 14 and 17 and all claims dependent therefrom, including Claims 15-16, are allowable. Claim 28 is amended to include similar limitations as allowable Claim 14 and is also believed to be allowable.

V. Conclusion

By virtue of the amendment of the claims and remarks thereto, all outstanding grounds of objection and rejection have been addressed and dealt with and based thereon, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Gloria Tsui-Yip
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,188
STOLL, MISKIN & BADIE
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4710
New York, NY 10118
(212) 268-0900